

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/789,398	02/27/2004	Kathleen M. Miller	98-P0151US2	JS2 4925	
27774 7.	590 09/28/2006		EXAMINER SWEET, THOMAS		
	/ILLIAMS PC VENUE WEST				
2ND FLOOR	VENUE WEST		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WESTFIELD,	NJ 07090		3738		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Commons	10/789,398	MILLER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Sweet	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addres	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. imely filed m the mailing date of this commu IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Thi 3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the practice.	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, p		erits is
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-94 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-94 are subject to restriction and/or 	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ction is required if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica ority documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Sta	nge
Attachment(s)	_		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-47 and 70-72, drawn to at least one biocompatible matrix, classified in class 424, subclass 423 on a Best Examinable Basis.
- II. Claims 48-69, drawn to a method of manufacture, classified in class 427, subclass356+.
- III. Claims 73-94, drawn to a stent, classified in class 623, subclass 1.15.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group II and group I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process, such as vapor deposition, spraying or dipping on selected portions.

Inventions Group III and Group I are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because claims 73 and 87 are evidence claims demonstrating that the particulars of

the subcombination are not required for patentability. The subcombination has separate utility such as therapeutic delivery device.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Inventions Group III and Group II are directed to an unrelated product and process. Product and process inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that the product cannot be used in, or made by, the process. See MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06. In the instant case, product cannot be made by the process, since one of the required components (microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor) is not required by the product.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.\

Upon election of one of the Groups above further elections of species and subspecies are required

Art Unit: 3738

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species of Implant devices:

Species A - a stent cover

Species B - a biliary stent

Species C - a ureteral stent

Species D - a pancreatic stent

Species E - a urinary catheter

Species F - a venous access device

Species G - a peritoneal access device

Species H - a device connecting or providing drainage between two sterile body environments

Species I - a device connecting or providing drainage between a non-sterile and a sterile body environment.

Upon election of one of the species above a further election of biocompatible polymer matrix is required.

Subspecies of biocompatible polymer matrix:

Subspecies Z - biodegradable

Subspecies Y - non-biodegradable.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,398

Art Unit: 3738

The species are independent or distinct because they are not disclosed or recognized as obvious variant and a burdensome search would be required to Examine the divergent subject matter.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim appears generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was made to David Bonham on 9/19/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Sweet whose telephone number is 571-272-4761. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am - 5:00pm, M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine M. McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,398

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thomas J Sweet

Examiner

Art Unit 3738

Page 7